

**Questions and Answers on the 2004-2005 W-2 Allocations
September 18, 2003**

**Q & A published on September 18, 2003
2004-2005 Allocations**

1. Question: The number of W-2 paid cases is based on a fifteen-month average not including the most recent months. In an environment of increasing caseloads why are the most recent months not included.

Answer: In the W-2 Contract for 2004 – 2005 the average was for 12 months and the most recent months available were used. The period used was July 2002 through June 2003. The Department will re-allocate benefit funding, in accordance with the timeline provided in Appendix A (Allocation Stipulations for the 2004-2005 W-2 and Related Programs Contract).

2. Question: The W-2 caseload number is based on the Research and Statistics report “W-2 with Payment Placement Caseload” numbers. There is a significant difference between this number and the number of actual checks received by participants from the C760 report. The difference ranges from 8 to as much as 17% more on the C760 report. Why was the actual paid number not used for caseload projections?

Answer: The C760 report on EOS, otherwise known as the 751 report, counts checks issued. The checks issued may be for prior months, a future month, or the current month. Supplemental checks account for this range of issuance. Also the same individual can have multiple checks. The report does not reflect payments made for the month. It reflects checks issued during the month. Therefore this count of checks issued does not reflect the actual current caseload and was not used.

3. Question: The average benefit payment statewide for this contract is \$479 per participant per month. The benefit allocation for the 04-05 contract is \$423 per participant per month. What is expected to happen that will decrease the average benefit payment.

Answer: The legislature defined a fixed amount of dollars available for benefits. We allocated those dollars based upon each agency's proportionate share of paid caseload numbers, with the exception of small agencies that were given a minimum of five (5) paid cases. An average benefit payment per case was not used.

4. Question: What reports were used to arrive at the twelve-month average caseload numbers for each Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) and Child Care (CC) (each type) cases?

Answer: New reports were developed for obtaining the during-the-month counts for FSET and Child Care. There are no standard reports that count the number of individuals during the month that are enrolled in FSET or CC. This meant the new reports needed to be developed.

The method for getting the during-the-month count of FSET participants was to count all enrolled FSET individuals who had an activity during the month. This was done for each of the 12 months. The twelve-month totals were averaged to get the final number, which was then weighted.

The method for getting Child Care counts was to use the families served count. This does not include W-2 with CC. This counts all families served who received a payment during the month. This was done for each of the 12 months. The twelve-month totals were averaged to get the final number, which was then weighted.

The counts in the Appendix A do not reflect the exact caseload for an agency. The methodology applied used the best available data, was weighted based on work effort, and was equitably applied to all agencies. The case counts in Appendix A reflect the work effort of an agency.

5. Question: Why did our FSET count go from 99 in the first published RFP Allocations to 70 in the revised RFP Allocations?

Answer: There was a change in the methodology to make it more consistent across programs. The FSET calculation that was first published was based upon the percent change that occurred from January 2002 to April of 2003 to project a May 2003 caseload. The second methodology used the caseload average for the period July 2002 through June of 2003. With both methodologies, a weighting factor of .81818 was applied.

6. Question: Why did our W-2 Paid caseload increase in the revised allocation and our benefit allocation decrease?

Answer: A number of changes occurred affecting the caseload numbers and the allocation amount. First, the time period changed. We used the most recent 12-month average, for the period of July 2002 through June 2003. Second, the total statewide allocation for benefits was reduced. The first publication was based on the statewide benefit allocation of \$126,056,608. The second publication is based on the final statewide benefit allocation amount of \$103,111,408. These changes affected the final benefit amount allocated to each agency.